



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/915,650	07/26/2001	Nassir Navab	2000P07791US01	7995

7590 02/23/2007
Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
186 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

CHOW, JEFFREY J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2628

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/915,650

Applicant(s)

NAVAB ET AL.

Examiner

Jeffrey J. Chow

Art Unit

2628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 46, 48, 50-54, 56 and 58-63 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 46, 48, 50-54, 56 and 58-63 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 08 January 2007 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 46, 48, 50 – 54, 56, and 58 – 60 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 61 and 62, filed 08 January 2007, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Harrington nor Rhoads teaches a 3-D animated virtual model (pages 8 and 9). Rhoads discloses embedding watermark in animated 3D graphical objects and the embedded object can be composited with a video stream to form a video program, such as a movie or television program and graphical objects that link to information or electronic commerce transactions can be added to a video product, such as a movie, when its converted from one format to another (column 18, lines 5 – 18). Rhoads is brought in to teach animated 3D graphical objects as he discloses animated 3D graphical objects. Embedding a watermark into an image would not teach the limitation of a 3-D animated virtual model.

Applicant argues that Harrington does not teach or disclose a need for displaying a 3D object in different poses to highlight different perspectives of the 3D object (page 9). The

Art Unit: 2628

claimed limitation is not expressly recited in claims 61 and 62. The claim limitation recites, “producing the augmented reality video by rendering the three-dimensional image data model of the product superimposed on the moving model plane in the video data, wherein a rendering of the three dimensional image data model has substantially the pose of the moving model plane”. Harrington discloses the unprojection step comprises the mathematical calculation comprising taking a two-dimensional image and determining what three-dimensional object could have created that two-dimensional image with respect to what the object can be and where it could have been positioned and the subject invention utilizes known dimensions with regard to the camera system and viewing plane, in combination with assumed characteristics of the piece of paper (column 7, lines 28 – 53). In other words, a three-dimensional object is rendered in the computer and the calculations are performed to transpose the three-dimensional object to fit on the piece of paper, which superimposes a two-dimensional image. The three-dimensional object being transposed to fit on a piece of paper, producing a two-dimensional image, reads on the mentioned limitation of the claim. The pose of the two-dimensional image takes the orientation of the piece of paper.

Claim Objections

Claim 54 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 54 cites, “the method, the method steps comprising:” at the end of the preamble. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 46, 48, 50 – 53, 61, and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 46, 48, 50 – 54, 56, and 58 – 62 appear to be directed to an abstract idea rather than a practical application of the idea. Practical application produces a useful, tangible and concrete result. In determining whether the claim is for a “practical application,” the focus is not on whether the steps taken to achieve a particular result are useful, tangible and concrete, but rather that the final result achieved by the claimed invention is “useful, tangible and concrete.” The claimed invention does not resulting a physical transformation nor does the claimed invention appear to provide a useful, concrete and tangible result. Specifically, the claimed invention does not appear to produce a tangible result because merely superimposing the rendered 3D model of the product on the moving model plane in the video data is nothing more than thoughts or computations within a processor. It fails to use or make available for use of the final result.

Claims 54, 56, and 58 – 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed towards nonfunctional descriptive material. Claims 54, 56, and 58 – 60 are as such do not exclude nonfunctional descriptive material. A computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is patent eligible subject matter if it is a computer element, which defines structure and function interrelationships between the computer program and the computer components, which permits the computer program’s functionality to be realized. The claims are directed to nonfunctional descriptive material and hence are nonstatutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 46, 52 – 54, and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Kato et al. (“Marker Tracking and HMD Calibration for a Video-based Augmented Reality Conferencing System”, 20 October 1999).

Regarding independent claim 46, Kato discloses an image with a whiteboard and ID cards that has markers (page 3, column 1, line 9 – column 2, line 4 and Figure 4), which reads on the claimed providing video data comprising images of a moving model plane having markers. Kato discloses calibrating the Head Mounted Display (HMD) and camera, and estimating an accurate position and pose of fiducial markers (page 4, column 2, lines 4 – 11), which reads on the claimed markers for calibrating a camera to track the motion of the model plane and the claimed determining a pose of the moving model plane according to the markers in the video data and calibration results. Kato discloses a 3D image data model of a product in a pose corresponding to the pose of the whiteboard and ID cards (Figures 3 and 4), which reads on the claimed creating a three dimensional image data model of a product in a pose corresponding to the pose of the moving model plane. Kato discloses the six markers are used to find the board

orientation and align virtual images (page 6, column 1, line 6 – column 2, line 5), which reads on the claimed orientation of the markers determines the orientation of the three dimensional image data model. Kato discloses a transformation of the relationship between marker coordinates and camera coordinates (page 4, column 2, line 12 – page 6, column 1, line 3) and the results of the virtual images (Figures 3 and 4), which reads on the claimed determining an image correspondence between the camera calibration results associated with the moving model plane and the three dimensional image data model. Kato discloses the final result of the 3D virtual objects on the whiteboard and ID cards (Figures 3 and 4), which reads on the claimed rendering a 3D model of the product based on the image correspondence and the claimed generating an augmented reality video by superimposing the rendered 3D model of the product on the moving model plane in the video data.

Regarding independent claim 54, claim 54 is similar in scope as to claim 46, thus the rejection for claim 46 hereinabove is applicable to claim 54.

Regarding dependent claims 52 and 60, Kato discloses a human manipulating an ID card (Figure 3), which reads on the claimed video data includes images of a human manipulating the pose of the model plane, wherein a rendering of the three-dimensional image model is manipulated according to the pose of the model plane.

Regarding dependent claim 53, Kato discloses the system uses computer vision techniques and have optimized algorithms for fast, accurate real time registration and convenient optical see-through HMD calibration (page, 2, column 1, lines 18 – 26), which reads on the claimed wherein the augmented reality video is produced in real time.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 48 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato et al. ("Marker Tracking and HMD Calibration for a Video-based Augmented Reality Conferencing System", 20 October 1999) in view of Harrington (US 6,898,307).

Regarding dependent claims 48 and 56, Kato did not expressly disclose scaling the three-dimensional image data model to the model plane according to the markers, though Kato does disclose simple transformation that could include scaling and also, transformations of the relationship between marker coordinates and camera coordinates (page 4, column 2, line 12 – page 6, column 1, line 3) and the sizes of the virtual screens on two ID cards being of different sizes and positions (Figure 3). Harrington discloses the translation, rotation, scaling and perspective operations can be applied to the image using standard image processing methods, or specialized textual mapping hardware may be employed for improving processing speed (column 5, lines 26 – 35). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kato's system to scale the three-dimensional virtual image according to the markers. One would be motivated to do so because simple known algebraic transformation in 3-D space helps improve processing speed and scaling the virtual images depending on the markers would prevent inaccurate and/or obscured virtual images.

Claims 61 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrington (US 6,898,307) in view of Rhoads et al. (US 7,050,603).

Regarding independent claim 62, Harrington discloses a camera 12 that captures the normal field of view of the user of the headset 10 that is substantially what the user would see without the headset 10 (column 4, lines 4 – 24) and the analog signal from the camera 12 is converted to a digitized frame that can be stored in the computer 18 for analysis (column 4, lines 25 – 38) and the computer 18 must interpret the captured video frames to locate a piece of paper within the camera view (column 4, lines 38 – 67 and column 5, lines 1 - 34) and the preselected movable real object comprises a reference panel such as a screen, tablet or piece of paper and the identifying includes recognizing a corner of the panel (claim 2), which reads on the claimed providing video data comprising images of a moving model plane having markers. It is inherent that a piece a paper, screen, or tablet is substantially rectangular, which reads on the claimed model plane is a substantially rectangular plane. Harrington discloses marker is a corner of the panel (claim 2) and a piece of paper can be identified by its white color against a darker background (column 4, line 55 – column 5, line 3), which reads on the claimed marker is a graphic disposed on an upper surface thereof. Harrington further discloses the unprojection module 82 that projects three-dimension object onto a two-dimensional viewing plane, where a two dimensional image results from the three dimensional object (column 7, lines 28 – 53), which reads on the claimed providing a three-dimensional image data model of a product. Harrington did not expressly disclose the three-dimensional image data model is an animation. Rhoads discloses embedding watermark in an animated 3D graphical objects and the embedded object can be composited with a video stream to form a video program, such as a movie or

Art Unit: 2628

television program and graphical objects that link to information or electronic commerce transactions can be added to a video product, such as a movie, when its converted from one format to another (column 18, lines 5 – 18). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Harrington's system by projecting 3D animated objects. One would be motivated to do so because 3D animated objects are used in many commonly used applications such as games (column 18, line 63 – column 19, line 5) or interactive shopping (column 20, lines 41 – 48) that provide users a more convincing virtual environment. Harrington further discloses the unprojection step comprises the mathematical calculation comprising taking a two-dimensional image and determining what three-dimensional object could have created that two-dimensional image with respect to what the object can be and where it could have been positioned and the subject invention utilizes known dimensions with regard to the camera system and viewing plane, in combination with assumed characteristics of the piece of paper (column 7, lines 28 – 53), which reads on the claimed determining a pose of the moving model plane according to the markers in the video data and the claimed determining an image correspondence between the moving model plane having markers and the three-dimensional image data model. Harrington discloses the camera provide the computer with the same view that the user sees so that the synthetic image is displayed or superimpose in a manner for comfortable and convenient interaction between the real reference item within the field of view that the user may be holding and manipulating (column 4, lines 4 – 37), which reads on the claimed producing the augmented reality video by rendering the three-dimensional image data model of the product superimposed on the moving model plane in the video data. Harrington discloses the user could select as the application image a particular internet browser engine

Art Unit: 2628

which, based upon the located orientation of the piece of paper, would be transformed to exactly match the detected orientation of the piece of paper so that the displayed image provides the illusion of the web page actually appearing on the blank piece of paper being held by the user and once the position of the paper page is determined, information can be used to correctly distort the application's image so it overlays the paper in the eyes of the user (column 5, lines 4 – 35) and the unprojection step comprises the mathematical calculation comprising taking a two-dimensional image and determining what three-dimensional object could have created that two-dimensional image with respect to what the object can be and where it could have been positioned and the subject invention utilizes known dimensions with regard to the camera system and viewing plane, in combination with assumed characteristics of the piece of paper (column 7, lines 28 – 53), which reads on the claimed rendering of the three-dimensional image data model has substantially the pose of the moving model plane. Harrington discloses video capture hardware that converts the analog signal from the camera into a digitized frame that can be stored in the computer and the hardware outputs a signal to the computer as a digitized and processible representation of what the user sees from the camera's field of view and the video generation hardware takes a bit map of pixel values from the computer and converts them into a television format that can be displayed on the headset and where the signal generated by the camera is different from the signal displayed on the headset by the addition of the computer-generated electronic image to thereby form a synthetic image as an augmented-reality display (column 4, lines 25 – 38), which reads on the claimed converting the augmented reality video into a streaming video format and the claimed streaming the augmented reality video having the streaming video format over a communications network to a computer for displaying the

Art Unit: 2628

augmented reality video. Harrington did not expressly disclose encoding hyperlink information into the augmented reality video and accessing information about the corresponding product by selecting the corresponding product in the rendered three-dimensional form from the augmented reality video. Rhoads discloses watermark may carry information or programmatic action or link to external information or an action, such as retrieval and output of information stored elsewhere in a database, website, etc (column 4, lines 31 – 39) and watermark can be embedded immediately into a video object layer after a graphical model is rendered to the video object layer (column 4, lines 40 – 49) and users selecting a video object, retrieving the linked information or actions for the selected object and rendering them on its user interface (column 16, lines 16 – 38). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify Harrington's system by embedding hyperlink information into 3D rendered objects when selected. One would be motivated to do so because this gives users the convenience of retrieving extra information about the selected desired object from an external source upon request.

Regarding independent claim 61, claim 61 is similar in scope as to claim 62, thus the rejection for claim 62 hereinabove is applicable to claims 61.

Claims 50, 51, 58, and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato et al. ("Marker Tracking and HMD Calibration for a Video-based Augmented Reality Conferencing System", 20 October 1999) in view of Rhoads et al. (US 7,050,603).

Regarding dependent claims 50, 51, 58, and 59, Kato did not expressly disclose encoding hyperlink information into the augmented reality video and accessing information

Art Unit: 2628

about the corresponding product by selecting the corresponding product in the rendered three-dimensional form from the augmented reality video. Rhoads discloses watermark may carry information or programmatic action or link to external information or an action, such as retrieval and output of information stored elsewhere in a database, website, etc (column 4, lines 31 – 39) and watermark can be embedded immediately into a video object layer after a graphical model is rendered to the video object layer (column 4, lines 40 – 49) and users selecting a video object, retrieving the linked information or actions for the selected object and rendering them on its user interface (column 16, lines 16 – 38). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify Kato's system by embedding hyperlink information into 3D rendered objects when selected. One would be motivated to do so because this gives users the convenience of retrieving extra information about the selected desired object from an external source upon request.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey J. Chow whose telephone number is (571)272-8078. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 10:00AM - 5:00PM (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ulka Chauhan can be reached on (571)-272-7782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2628

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JJC


ULKA CHAUHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER